



*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Division.....*I*.....

Section ....*7*.....

Shelf.....

Number.....





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

THE  
**Jewish Expositor,**

AND

FRIEND OF ISRAEL.

---

MAY, 1818.

---

REVIEW.

“An Answer to a Sermon preached, by the Rev. *Charles Simeon*, M. A. of King’s College, Cambridge, at the Church of St. Catharine Cree, Leadenhall Street, on Wednesday Evening, Dec. 31, 1817; relative to the Question between Jews and Christians. By Benjamin Abrahams, an Israelite.” London: Wilson, Royal Exchange. 1818.

Our readers have already been apprized, in our last number, that the Sermon preached by Mr. Simeon on the eve of the New-Year, for the instruction, principally, of the Jews, had called forth an Answer from one of their body. Of this Answer it will naturally be expected that we should take some notice; and accordingly we proceed to make a few observations upon it, which we can assure the Author we are desirous of doing in the spirit of Christian kind-

ness and conciliation. We feel it due to him to acknowledge that his pamphlet is written in a mild, candid, and amicable temper; and on this account we feel the greater confidence that he will peruse our remarks upon it with that seriousness and attention which the great importance of the subject demands.

Mr. Abrahams prefaces his reply, which is addressed in the form of a letter to Mr. Simeon, by expressing the surprise he felt on the evening of his attendance at St. Catharine Cree, at hearing the sixty-sixth chapter of Isaiah rehearsed by the minister of the parish. Probably his surprise was in some measure increased, by supposing that that particular chapter had been purposely selected for that occasion, as he might not be aware that it is the one appointed for the last evening of the year, in the regular course of our church service by our book of Common Prayer. Be this as it may



however, Mr. Abrahams states the grounds of his surprise in the following terms:

"This surprised me not a little, conceiving that we were called on, from this chapter, not to depart from our religion, for it seemed to me that the Christians were invited to embrace the Jewish faith, or that the Rev. Gentleman intended that the Jewish persuasion should give no heed to what you was about to relate. I appeal to you, or any rational person to say, if a chapter in the Bible can be found more explicit than the one alluded to for the Israelites to abide in their real belief. I shall quote the 17th verse, which I think will convince any one, that this chapter alludes to the Jews only—'*Eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord.*' From what is here quoted, how can any person be called a Jew who eateth swine's flesh, when it is particularly set forth in our holy law, in Levit. and Deut. xiv. 8. '*And the swine, because it divideth the hoof, yet cheweth not the cud, it is unclean unto you.*' You, no doubt, Rev. Sir, are well convinced that to this precept we adhere, and are not liable to any curse on that account; but more of this hereafter."

That the chapter in question relates solely to the Jews, we should have less difficulty in allowing to Mr. Abrahams, than some of the learned doctors of his own nation would have, who are much perplexed, and not a little divided amongst themselves, in their exposition of it. We certainly are of opinion that the Jews form the

*principal*, though not altogether the *exclusive*, subject of the chapter. But we are very far from thinking with Mr. A. that its design is to confirm them in 'their real belief,' or (as we suppose he would explain those terms) in their attachment to Judaism and their prejudices against the Christian religion. On the contrary we consider it as foretelling, in the plainest terms, the abolition of the Jewish ceremonial, and temple worship (ver. 1, 2.)—the displeasure of Jehovah against those Jews who obstinately adhered to the Levitical institutions, after the temporary purpose for which they were enacted had been accomplished (ver. 3.)—his threatenings against them for 'choosing their own ways,' and refusing to hearken to his voice, calling to them in the Gospel of his Son (ver. 3, 4. 6.)—his encouragements and promises to such as were "poor and of a contrite spirit and trembled at his word," *i. e.* those who with humility and reverence received the Gospel, and who on that account were 'hated and cast out by their Jewish brethren for his name's sake' (ver. 2. 5.)—the rapid enlargement, and glorious state of his church, through the abundant accession of Jewish and Gentile converts, in the first ages of Christianity, and, more especially, in a period still future (ver. 7—14.)—the terrible destruction of his enemies of all nations gathered together on the great day of the Lord—and

the consequent manifestation of the divine glory, and diffusion of the true knowledge of Jehovah throughout the whole world, by means of the reciprocal instrumentality of Jews and Gentiles (ver. 15—24). With respect to the 17th verse, on a partial quotation of which Mr. Abrahams seems to rest his interpretation of the design of the whole chapter, it will be difficult for him to prove that it relates to *Jewish converts to Christianity* (as we understand him to insinuate, though he does not very clearly explain his meaning) unless he can shew that *Christians* “sanctify themselves and purify themselves behind one tree in the midst,” (whatever be the precise meaning or proper rendering of the original in this latter clause) or that it forms any part of their design, in their endeavours to bring over their Jewish brethren to Christianity, to induce them to “eat swine’s flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse.” If this verse relate *solely to Jews*, it must be to *hypocritical and apostate professors of Judaism*, to those ‘which say they are Jews and are not;’ (as it is expressed in our Scriptures, Rev. ii. 9.) for a violation of those ordinances which are *binding upon Jews alone*, (such as the forbidding swine’s flesh, &c.) can evidently be criminal in those only who *profess themselves Jews*, and can be no fault at all in those of other religions, such as the Christian, whether they be Christians by birth, or made

converts to Christianity from Judaism. We rather apprehend however, that the judgments denounced in the 17th verse relate to God’s enemies *in general*, of whatever nation or religious profession, as it is expressly said in the 16th verse that ‘the Lord will plead with *all flesh*,’ and that their iniquities are characterized in terms borrowed from the prevailing abominations amongst apostate Jews and the idolatrous nations surrounding them, in the prophet’s time. Mr. Simeon no doubt is ‘well convinced that to *this* precept (viz. that forbidding swine’s flesh) the Jews adhere;’ but remembering that there are *other* things, as well as this, which the same ‘Lord hath spoken,’ (Exod. xix. 8.) he may sometimes have been ready to exclaim, ‘O si sic omnia!’ well knowing that it is not *adhering too closely*, but not *adhering closely enough*, to what God has spoken to their fathers, which is the grand obstacle to their reception of Christianity; and that, if they ‘believed Moses and the prophets,’ they would also believe *Him* of whom Moses and the prophets, no less than the apostles and evangelists, have written.

But we proceed to notice Mr. Abrahams’ comments upon the Sermon itself, to which his pamphlet is professedly an Answer; and in the first place we must point out some misrepresentations into which he has evidently been betrayed from not understanding the preach-

er's meaning, or from an inaccurate recollection of what he delivered from the pulpit. For instance, he represents Mr. Simeon as having asserted that the words of his text (Deut. xxx. 11, &c.) "In thy mouth and in thy heart," allude immediately to *Christ, as the personal subject of them*; (p. 5, 7.) and then endeavours to fasten upon him the charge of self-contradiction. 'Observe the words, "It is not in heaven:" now how will you reconcile that? You must then believe Jesus is not in heaven.' (p. 5.) Whereas Mr. Simeon explained the words (as our readers have seen in our last number, p. 104.) of *the gospel way of salvation*, in reference to which, he contended, Moses told the Israelites that 'the word was very nigh them, in their mouth and in their heart.' Again—Mr. Simeon does not quote Deut. xxvii. 26.) for the purpose of proving (as stated by Mr. Abrahams, p. 5, 7.) that the Jews are under a curse if they do not believe that the words 'in thy mouth, &c.' allude to Jesus; but to convince them, by the express declaration of their own scriptures, *that they are guilty and condemned by the moral law*. (See our last number, p. 104.) Neither does Mr. Simeon make so great a mistake as that imputed to him (p. 15, 17.) by Mr. A. of saying that the *scape-goat was sacrificed*; he expressly says, what indeed it was impossible he should be ignorant of, that the *scape-goat*, after having had

the sins of the children of Israel confessed over him, was sent away into the wilderness. (Jewish Expos. p. 105.) We note these inaccuracies in Mr. A.'s statements merely for his own benefit; and we beg at the same time to assure him, that nothing can be further from us than the imputing to him any *intentional* misrepresentation. We are persuaded, as is Mr. Simeon himself, that the misapprehensions to which we have adverted are such as might have happened to many hearers, especially if unaccustomed to public addresses from the pulpit.

We wish that all the points of difference between the Sermon and the Answer to it, admitted of as easy an explanation. We regret however, to observe many sentiments advanced by Mr. Abrahams, both relating to the Address and extraneous to it, on which, as they involve some of the fundamental errors entertained by our Jewish brethren, we think it necessary to offer a few remarks.

In order to refute Mr. Simeon's application of the words of his text to the gospel method of salvation, Mr. Abrahams asserts, that they contain nothing farther than an exhortation to the Israelites to keep the law, and that they are incapable of any other construction. And further to substantiate this position, he affirms that the Mosaical law was never intended for any other nation but the Jews, and can-



not therefore admit of any interpretation applicable to Christ or to Christians. Referring to the curse denounced against transgressors in Deut. xxvii. 26. he argues thus :

“ Now as to the curse, does not that verse distinctly say, ‘ All the words of the law ? ’ The curse you are here quoting is to such as profane the Mosaical law, and certainly is meant to no other nation but the Jews. Our holy law was never intended for any other nation ; the first of the ten commandments witnesseth this assertion—‘ I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.’ Was either you or your forefathers ever in Egyptian bondage ? It was to the house of Israel, a prediction foretold to our father Abraham many centuries prior thereto : and fifty days after that redemption, it pleased the Almighty to give unto his people Israel his holy law by the hand of his faithful servant Moses. From what is here expressed, it plainly shews, that no other nation is punishable for profaning this law but the Jews ; and it would be unreasonable to suppose, that we should apply to any nation to instruct us in a law, wholly unconnected with any but the Jews.

If it were our only object to defeat Mr. Abrahams' arguments, it might be sufficient to observe, that the reasoning he here adopts is perfectly illogical and inconclusive. ‘ The law was addressed to the Israelites after their coming out of Egypt, therefore, it was intended for the Israelites only, and is wholly unconnected with

any other nation.’ His premises we allow—his conclusion we utterly deny. In fact it is what logicians call a *petitio principii*—an assumption of the very subject, in dispute. Mr. Simeon in his Address does not deny that the law was delivered immediately to the children of Israel, but he contends that the Gospel is wrapt up in the law, and, as it were, veiled beneath its surface. If Mr. Simeon have proved this position, then the law evidently is *not* ‘ unconnected with any but the Jews,’ but is co-extensive in its reference and application with the Gospel itself. And to deny that the Gospel is thus enveloped in the law, because the law exclusively respects the Jews, is to take for granted the very point in question. As we wish, however, not merely to confute, but to convince, Mr. Abrahams and his brethren, we shall endeavour to point out the erroneousness of his opinion respecting the exclusive reference of the Mosaical law to the Jews.

In the first account given us of the calling of Abraham and of the declaration of the divine purposes respecting him, we find God telling him, (Gen. xii. 2, 3.) “ I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great ; and thou shalt be a blessing . . . . . and, in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” Now though this promise was to receive its grand and final accomplishment in the coming of the Messiah,

who was to spring from Abraham according to the flesh, yet it is by no means to be restricted to that great event simply considered. It is evident from a comparison of the passage just quoted, with others recording the substance of the divine communications to the illustrious patriarch, that the honour was conferred upon him of being a blessing to mankind in *the whole line of his natural posterity*, at least in that branch of it which sprung from Isaac, as well as in the single person of the Messiah, and those who through a spiritual alliance with him should become the *spiritual* seed of Abraham. (Comp. Gen. xiii. 15, 16. xv. 5. 13. and xvii. 4—9. xxii. 17, 18.) And such has been the fact, ever since the formation of the Jews into a separate people. The knowledge and worship of the one true God was preserved amongst them, when the rest of the world was overspread with idolatry—they were constituted depositaries with whom the records of the divine proceedings and the revelations of the divine will, were lodged in trust for the benefit of the human race—their nation formed, as it were, a theatre of action on which God exhibited his character, and the laws and purposes of his moral government, in the face of the whole world. (See, amongst other passages, Exod. ix. 16. Lev. xxvi. 45. Deut. iv. 6—8. xxviii. 10. 37. 46. 1 Chron. xvi. 24. Ps. xviii. 49. xli. 10.

xcviii. 2.) This being the case with regard to the general course of his procedure towards the nation of Israel, can we for a moment suppose that in a transaction which forms so prominent a feature in his administration as the giving of the law, his views were confined within the narrow limits which separated them from the rest of mankind, and that he had no regard to the moral and spiritual interests of the world at large? To suppose this would be to impute an anomaly and defectiveness, in one of its most important branches, to a system of moral administration of which we are repeatedly informed, in the general, that it had respect to the universal body of his creatures.

Accordingly, we Christians feel ourselves under the greatest obligations to the Jews, as the medium through which the holy law of God has been made known to us. And, coming to us through that medium, we consider it no less binding upon us, in all those respects in which it is of permanent and universal application, than if it had been addressed immediately to ourselves by the voice of God. The law of the ten commandments, setting forth the duties which men owe to their Maker and to each other, manifestly applies with equal force to all the sons of Adam. And though the same cannot be said with respect to the ceremonial and judicial regulations prescribed to the Israelites, which had the force of *moral*

obligation upon them alone, inasmuch as they resulted from that *peculiar* relation in which they stood to God, yet even respecting these we should have concluded, by the analogy of sound reason, that they were designed in some way or other to benefit and instruct other nations, though without the aid of an express revelation from God, such as that afforded in the Christian Scriptures, we should have been unable to ascertain the precise bearing which they had upon the general interests of mankind. But now having obtained, as we believe and are sure, from heaven itself, the clue to the just interpretation of the Mosaical institutes, can we refrain from rendering back to our elder brethren of the house of Israel the obligation which we owe them, and pointing out to them the way in which they, in common with ourselves, may make a proper use of that inestimable benefit? We esteem it our privilege to do this—we count it our duty so to do, in conformity to that very law which we have received through their means, and which teaches us (Lev. xix. 18.) ‘to love our neighbour as ourselves.’ We believe it to be no less a part of the divine dispensation that we Gentiles should, now in these latter ages of the world, be God’s instruments in leading his people Israel to the true understanding of their law, than it was in the first ages of the world a part of his dispensation that they should be en-

trusted with that law for the benefit of mankind in general. As they were then stewards of God for us—so are we now stewards of God for them. And we humbly trust that, as the obligation is reciprocal, so will the benefit be reciprocal likewise.

Should, however, Mr. Abrahams, or others of his nation, still be disposed to regard as presumptuous the endeavours of Christians to enlighten them as to the true meaning and grand design of their law, and to quote (as he does, p. 6, 7.) in support of this opinion, the testimony of Moses (Deut. iv. 5, &c.) we must remind them that the privileges enjoyed by any set of men are one thing, the use they make of those privileges another; and that the moral improvement of communities, as well as of individuals, is not always in proportion to the opportunities and means of improvement which the goodness of God has afforded them. Of the truth of this, their own history furnishes many lamentable proofs; and we need go no farther than those very addresses in the beginning of Deuteronomy, in which Moses recounts their superior advantages, to learn that whilst they had no cause for self-exaltation, they had much for humiliation and self-abasement. Nor can we avoid observing that, in the passage itself above cited by Mr. Abrahams, it is not their having received statutes and judgments such as no other people had, but their *keeping*



and doing them which it is said would be their wisdom and understanding in the sight of surrounding nations. But on this point we forbear to enlarge at present, as we shall have occasion to recur to it when we come to notice a subsequent part of Mr. A.'s pamphlet.

We do not clearly perceive the bearing of Mr. A.'s observations towards the conclusion of his 7th page. By way of illustrating the impossibility of coming to God by the law, Mr. Simeon had referred to the wish expressed by the Israelites (Deut. v. 27.) that God, instead of speaking to them *any more* himself, would communicate his will to them through the mediation of Moses. Mr. A. seems to dispute the correctness of this statement, as though it went to deny that God spake *at all* himself to the congregation of Israel, than which evidently nothing could be farther from Mr. S.'s meaning. The preacher, without doubt, was as sensible as Mr. A. himself can be, that 'it requires no proof that God descended on Mount Sinai, and gave unto them his holy law, and that they heard him speak to Moses;'—but surely Mr. A. does not mean to deny that, as soon as they heard the ten commandments from the mouth of God, they desired not to hear his voice any more, saying to Moses, 'Speak thou with us and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die.' (Exod. xx. 19. Deut. v. 24—31.) And what was this

but desiring that God would address them *through a mediator?*—which is all that Mr. Simeon asserts. And certainly their doing so did very strikingly indicate, as Mr. S. contends, the moral impossibility of our having access to a holy God through the works of a law which condemns us for our disobedience, and the necessity of *some other medium* through which we may approach him without incurring the punishment due to our transgressions. This plain conclusion, however, Mr. Abrahams evades, by passing to a consideration totally distinct from Mr. Simeon's argument and irrelevant to it—"therefore," says he, "before we could accept any other law, we must hear God speak again." (p. 8.) And "if it were possible for Moses to return and offer unto us a new law, we should not receive it, unless God himself was heard in the midst of us." (ibid.) Mr. Simeon neither disputes the fact of God's having been heard himself in the midst of Israel, nor the authenticity—and consequently not the authority—of the law, as proceeding from him. Neither does he say a syllable about offering them a *new law*, or about their acceptance of such a law if offered. His sole object is to lead them to a *right understanding and proper use of the law they already have*, as delivered to them by Moses, and as contained in their own Scriptures. Being convinced that the law, *if rightly under-*



stood, would lead them to the Gospel, and that this was the grand and ultimate design with which it was given to their fathers, he is desirous above all things that they should study it with the deepest attention, and most profound reverence, with earnest prayer for the teaching of God's good Spirit, as David did, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law:" — "Give me understanding and I shall keep thy law; yea I shall observe it with my whole heart." (Ps. cxix. 18. 34.) Could we but be assured that the Jews thus sought, in humble reliance upon divine instruction, to find out the *hidden meaning* of their law, we should have little doubt but that the grand points of difference between them and Christians would speedily be done away. We fear, however, that too many of them, whilst they 'make their boast of the law,' and of God as its author, are not only very imperfectly acquainted with its ordinances and requirements, but entertain opinions very much at variance with their professed acknowledgment of its divine authority. Witness their devoted attachment to their *oral* law, and to the traditions and maxims of their rabbinical writers, many of which are in direct opposition to the law as given by Moses. Witness the assertion, which Mr. Abrahams himself attempts to defend in a subsequent part of his pamphlet, that under their law "sa-

crifice and blood were not needed for the remission of sin;" and the doctrine so generally maintained by the Jews of the present age, that "repentance expiates all transgressions." We trust we shall presently make it appear that these are positions which do indeed deserve to be called "*a new law*," such as God was never "heard to speak in the midst of Israel," nor Moses to communicate by divine command.

It is quite unnecessary, therefore, for Mr. Abrahams to go about to prove (as he proceeds to do, p. 8, 9.) that "God never intended to give the Israelites any other law," and that "it is impossible for them to adhere to any other law than that given to them by Moses." Christians themselves acknowledge, as fully as any Jew can do, the perfection of the Mosaic law *for the purposes for which it was given*, and the *immutability* of it likewise, except in those parts in which the Old Testament itself, as well as the nature of some particular ordinances, declares it to have been temporary and mutable. The *ceremonial* law we consider to have been virtually abrogated by the coming of Jesus, because in him its typical and transient purposes were fully accomplished—but the *moral law*, the law of the two tables, we deem as unchangeable as is the nature of Him who gave it, and the relation in which his creatures stand to him and to each other.

In no sense do we contend that Jesus was sent by God to introduce a *new law*; though we consider him as having mediated a *new covenant*, according to the promise of God in the Old Testament (Jer. xxxi. 31. and elsewhere.) One of the most prominent and characteristic privileges of this 'new and better covenant,' is to have '*the law written on the heart*,' and so far from annulling or superseding the law of the ten commandments, as a directory of conduct, Jesus, in his prophetic character, expressly enjoins the strictest observance of it upon his followers, and points out its purity and extent in a much clearer light than it had ever been exhibited by any prophet that preceded him.

The mention of Jesus Christ as a *prophet* leads us to notice the argument which Mr. Abrahams makes use of to justify their rejection of what he calls "any other law," founded on Exod. xix. 9. He acknowledges their paramount obligation to yield implicit obedience to the Mosaic law, because God himself "spoke with their fathers," and charged them to "believe Moses for ever." We quite agree with Mr. A. in the justness of this inference, and exceedingly wish him and his brethren to believe implicitly in Moses (as we do ourselves), even *in all things* which God has spoken by him. But we beg him to apply the same conclusive mode of reasoning to another passage, of the same authority as the former. (Deut.

xviii. 15—19.) 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a *prophet* from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; *unto him shall ye hearken*; according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. *I will raise them up a prophet* from among their brethren, *like unto thee*, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that *whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.*' On this passage we would found two or three plain questions, which we earnestly recommend to the serious attention of Mr. Abrahams and his brethren.

1. Is not the command of God to yield implicit obedience to the prophet here spoken of, equally express and equally binding with that on which they justly rest the prophetic authority of Moses?

2. Can they point out any prophet, amongst those sent at different times to their nation, in whose person the promise here made has been fulfilled? At whatever period the passage quoted by Mr. A. (Deut. xxxiv. 10.) was added, it is clear that it had not *then* been fulfilled;



and Mr. Abrahams, from his manner of quoting it, seems to think that it has never yet been fulfilled.

3. Can they *disprove* that it has been fulfilled in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, in whom Christians maintain, and *prove by many arguments hitherto unanswered*, that it has received its accomplishment?

4. If they *cannot* disprove this, are they not witnesses against themselves, that they are guilty of an awful act of disobedience to the command of God and to the authority of his servant Moses, in rejecting the authority and instructions of Jesus?

If Mr. A. replies to these questions, 'In the passage quoted by me (Exod. xix. 9.) we are commanded to believe Moses *for ever*, and therefore we cannot believe Jesus, because he is contrary to Moses, and has taught a *new law*, different from that of Moses,'—we answer, '*this* is the very point in question, and must not be assumed, but proved;—we maintain that Jesus has taught nothing contrary to the law, and that the Gospel, so far from being contradictory to, or even distinct from, the law, is in entire agreement with the law, *properly understood* and clearly contained in it.' It is the object of Mr. Simeon's Address to shew this—and his arguments have not been answered by Mr. Abrahams.

With regard to his implied objection, founded on Deut. xiii. 1—3, we beg his attentive

examination of a discourse on that text, preached some time ago by the same zealous friend of Israel, and re-published in our last number.

[To be continued.]

LETTER ON THE  
PASSAGE OF THE RED SEA  
BY THE  
CHILDREN OF ISRAEL,  
IN THEIR ROUTE FROM EGYPT TO  
MOUNT SINAI.

[Concluded from page 142.]

I myself, in company with Mr. Fronton, took the very same journey as that pursued by the children of Israel in their departure from Egypt. My object being to trace their route, we determined as much as possible to chuse a similar season of the year.\*

We sat out from Cairo in March, and like the Israelites, precisely at the time of the full moon. Like them too we encamped at Ramesses, Succoth, Etham, and Phi-Hahiroth, and accomplished the whole of our excursion with the greatest ease in three short days' journey.† Judging by the number of hours in which we performed it, we concluded the whole distance to be about twenty-six French leagues. And we concluded that the Israelites might with perfect ease march every day nine leagues. This would be by no means difficult to a people habitually inured to the hardest labour, and already accustomed to hunger, thirst, and all the

\* Pere Sicard.

† Ibid.

rigors of a hard and oppressive servitude; especially when animated by the hope of recovering their liberty. The road too is perfectly easy and commodious, and the time of year as favourable as possible; the air soft and the heat temperate. And in their case, being moreover freshened by the pillar of a cloud which went before and shaded them.\*

Although the children of Israel must have consisted of above two millions of souls with baggage and innumerable flocks and herds; they were yet not likely to experience any inconvenience in their march. Several thousand persons might walk abreast with the greatest ease, in the very narrowest part of the valley in which they at first began to file off. It soon afterwards expands to above three leagues in width. With respect to forage, they would be at no loss. The ground is covered with tamarisk, broom, clover, and saintfoin; of which latter especially, camels are passionately fond; besides almost every other variety of odoriferous plant and herb proper for pasturage.† This may appear surprizing to us, in a place described as a *wilderness*; but we are to recollect that the Hebrew word דבר applies not merely to barren deserts, but to those vast and uncultivated grassy steppes, which are not regularly inhabited; and which furnish pasturage to the flocks, not only of

rude and nomadic tribes, but of more civilized nations. Of this sort, it is well known, was the wilderness of Judæa, in which John the Baptist exercised his ministry. The whole of the sides of the valley through which the children of Israel marched, are tufted with brushwood, which are equally proper to afford food to their beasts, together with many drier sorts fit for lighting fires, on which the Israelites could with the greatest ease bake the dough they brought with them, on small iron plates, which form a constant appendage to the baggage of oriental travellers. Lastly, the herbage underneath these trees and shrubs is completely covered with snails of a prodigious size, and of the best sort; and however uninviting such a repast might appear to us, they are here esteemed a great delicacy. They are so plentiful in this valley, that it may be literally said that it is difficult to take one step without treading upon them. The Israelites indeed could only meet with water at their halting places; but at each of them it was plentiful.\*

Moses had probably received an order from Pharaoh to turn down to the south into the wilderness of Thebais, as soon as they should have passed the valley between Mount Dioüchi and Mount Tora; in order that taking a road, in a precisely opposite direction to the Isthmus of Suez, it might be-

---

\* Pere Sicard.

† Ibid.

\* Pere Sicard.



come impossible for them to escape into Arabia. Moses however, instead of turning to the south, as soon as he had passed this defile, kept straight on, through the valley of Degeli, towards the Red Sea. Hence perhaps it may be, that the Arabs to this day call the Valley of Degeli the *Valley of Deception*. As soon as the Egyptians saw that the Israelites took this road, they brought word to Pharaoh in the words of the text, "That the people fled," (Exod. xiv. 5.) a remarkable expression, and which I think can only be fairly interpreted, on the supposition that Moses had previously had a peculiar route prescribed to him. Pharaoh, on the reception of this intelligence, instantly resolved to pursue them at the head of his army, which if we may believe Josephus would present no difficulty. Josephus describes this armament as consisting of two hundred thousand warriors, fifty thousand horsemen, and six hundred armed chariots. (Josephus' Antiquities, lib. iii. cap. 92.) Herodotus asserts the whole standing armed force of the Egyptian Pharaohs to have consisted of four hundred and ten thousand soldiers; namely, two hundred and fifty thousand calasires, and one hundred and fifty thousand hermotybes, and he says these troops were chiefly stationed in the Delta not far from Memphis. It could not then be difficult quickly to assemble an amazing force; and

indeed it seems more than probable, that a very considerable part of the Egyptian army, must have been stationed about the camp of the Israelites at Ramesses, in order to watch the motions of so large a body of disaffected persons assembled close to the capital.\*

The first station of the Hebrews was in the plain of Gendeli, near a small but abundant spring of fresh water. Gendeli is the Succoth of Scripture. Besides the circumstance of its being situated precisely at one third of the way, viz. between eight and nine leagues from Ramesses, and close by a spring of fresh water, the word Gendeli in Arab signifies a *military encampment*, and Succoth, in Hebrew means the place of pitching soldiers' tents.† Here they halted for the night, and baked their unleavened bread on the little portable hearths or iron plates before mentioned.

The second station of the children of Israel must have been the plain of Ramlie; which is distant nine leagues from Succoth, and eight from the Red Sea. It is the ancient Etham; a beautiful plain forming an amphitheatre of six miles wide, and bordered with rising hills. The body of the army pitched their tents in the plain, whilst their leaders might be commodiously stationed on the eminences. The sacred text asserts expressly, that Etham was at the extremity of the desert; and this

† Pere Sicard.

† Ibid.

exactly corresponds with the situation of Ramlic. In truth, on quitting Etham you enter a narrow defile, which continues without interruption for two leagues, and then opens into the plain of Bede; which may rather be called the environs of the Red Sea, than the continuation of the desert.\*

The sacred text then proceeds to say that in the third day's march the Israelites turned back to encamp by Migdol. The fact is this. Etham is situated at the bottom of a deep sort of *bay* (if I may use such an expression) which the plain forms in the bosom of the chain of the Torah mountains; and which leaves no exit from Etham to the plain of Bede, but by a very narrow defile, through which a dozen men could scarcely march abreast. This defile is to the east, and goes straight on to the Red Sea. Now it would have been the height of imprudence in the army of Israel to have entangled themselves in this narrow pass; besides, one whole day would not have sufficed them to clear it. By the divine command, Moses then directed the army to turn its back on the defile; and to retrace their steps from the bosom of what I have termed the bay of Etham, coasting the foot of the mountain, till they should weather the promontory formed by the extreme point of the amphitheatrical chain of the mountains of Torah; which having done, you immediately

enter a wide and spacious valley, which after bearing a little to the north, takes a sudden turn to the east, and terminates in the plain of Bede; which as I before observed is the low flat land immediately on the shore of the Red Sea. This circuit I myself examined on the spot, and laid it down exactly in a little map which I made to illustrate my observations, and which you will do well to consult as you read my letter. The addition which this circuitous road would occasion is just one league; so that including this deviation, the day's journey would be only nine leagues, which is precisely the same with the two former ones. The plain of Bede, which in the Arabic signifies the plain of the *unparalleled prodigy*, extends six leagues along the shore of the Red Sea.\* It is terminated on the northern extremity by lofty and precipitous mountains of bare and craggy rocks; the most elevated of which is called Baal-Zephon;† which in Hebrew signifies *Lord of the north*, or *Lord our watchman or protector*. This mountain was so called both from its northern situation as it respects the plain Bede; and from its position as the Egyptian frontier. For in this elevated height which overlooks the Red Sea below, was placed with incredible labour, a huge

---

\* Pere Sicard.

† See Wells' Scripture Geography on this article; likewise פֶּלֶא in Parkhurst, and Taylor, and Adam Clarke, and Gill's Notes on the Passage.

---

\* Pere Sicard.



and gigantic idol, called Baal-Zephon, which was adored by the Egyptians as their great protector, and as the divine guardian of their frontier. This mountain is now called Eutauqua, which also signifies north as well as the *place of deliverance*. At the southern extremity, and just opposed to the huge granite rocks of Baal-Zephon, the plain of Bede is inclosed by a lofty and rocky range of mountains, the most elevated of which is called Magdalum, or Migdol; so called from its impregnable and elevated situation. Its present Arabic name of *Kouiabe* signifies the same thing. Formerly, this steep promontory was the site of a strong fortress. From the foot of this mountain proceeds a torrent of hot saline mineral water, which precipitates itself into the sea. Strabo particularly mentions this circumstance, and I am inclined to think that Diodorus meant to allude to this hot spring, when he says that those coming from the town of Arsinoe, and passing the plain of Bede, meet several hot springs.\*

It was at the extremity of the plain of Bede, near these hot springs, that the hosts of Israel encamped, close to the sources of Thouairecq. This is the place called in Scripture Phi-Hahiroth, and which was the third station of the Israelites. The name of this place in Hebrew signifies the *Mouth of the holes*, and Thouairecq

in Arabic signifies *gaping holes or conduits*. This place has probably been so denominated from ten or twelve little sources of salt, or brackish water, issuing from reservoirs artificially cut in the rock, but now nearly choked with sand. The plain of Bede is, as I have observed, six leagues in width. The Israelites extended the front of their army as widely as possible towards Migdol, which is the position opposite which the sea is narrowest. The Egyptians, on the contrary, marched towards Baal-Zephon, in order to take possession of that post, and to prevent even the impossible chance of the escape of any part of the Hebrew army by turning up the narrow defile which winds round that mountain on the sea coast, and by a path scarcely wide enough for twenty men to stand abreast, leads direct to Suez, or the ancient Arsinoe. One view of the little map subjoined, will shew you that the army of the Israelites was now completely hemmed in. Enclosed by the impassable barriers, formed of the inaccessible crags of Baal-Zephon and of Migdol on either side, limited by the ocean in front, and pent in by the troops of Egypt behind, they were circumscribed by a line of circumvallation which was, humanly speaking, absolutely impenetrable. In the horrors of so hopeless a situation, the unbelieving Israelites could no longer contain their murmurs. They saw themselves appa-

---

\* Pere Sicard.

rently lost without resource. Dismay and consternation pervaded the whole camp, and they began with one voice to reproach Moses with bringing them to perish in that wilderness, as though there had been no graves in Egypt.\*

Then Moses, well knowing in whom he had believed, with unmoved constancy commanded the perturbed multitudes in the memorable words, "*Fear not! stand still and see the salvation of God.*" (Exod. xiv. 13.) Then God shewed that he alone was the supreme Lord of nature and the elements, an all-sufficient, a complete Saviour; and at the same time plainly demonstrated to the Egyptians, that he, not the vain idol Baal-Zephon, was the only true and mighty God, the only guardian and protector of his people. At his command, Moses strikes the waves with his rod. The waters divide; and receding on either side, leave a firm and dry bottom in the midst of the ocean. He commands, and the astonished army march between the wall of waters which flank them on either side. All march with confidence and without the loss of a moment's time. The command of God, the stupendous prodigy of their deliverance, the novelty of the road, their joy at so unexpected and unhopèd-for an escape, the assurance of freedom, all contributed to inspire them with alacrity and

exultation. The Israelites probably began their march close to Phi-Hahiroth, which is only half a mile from the shore. The sea being there only about fifteen miles across, whereas but a very little farther to the south, the passage is at least thirty miles, and consequently more than it would be possible to achieve in one night's march. The sacred text expressly informs us, that the Israelites reached the opposite shore at three in the morning. They must therefore have begun their march between six and seven in the evening, which is after sun-set, since it was in the equinox of March. This time would have been amply sufficient for the passage, which is perhaps a little more than five, and decidedly much under six leagues. Allowing for the mixed multitude of women and children, their numerous herds, and heavy baggage, it might possibly occupy that time. But assuredly that time is amply and abundantly sufficient.\*

Before the hosts of Israel entered the bed of the sea, they probably drew up in a broad front of three or four leagues, each tribe marching in its columns; whilst as they advanced, a hot and dry wind from the Lybian desert, dried up the sea before them, and at three in the morning they arrived in the wilderness of Shur. The army thus divided into tribes, each marshalled into its

---

\* Pere Sicard, and Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 6.

---

\* Pere Sicard.



respective houses and families, and marching in a regular order, would present a broad front of two or three leagues in extent. In front, Josephus assures us, their venerable law-giver\* led the way, re-assuring the multitude by first tempting himself this unheard-of passage. Next to him, the sacred deposit, the bones of the patriarch Joseph, was accompanied by princes of all the tribes of his brethren, who had sworn to take them back to the land of their forefathers, and to deposit them in the sepulchre of their ancestors at Hebron; where they had several centuries before placed the remains of his brethren.† Then followed the hosts of Israel in their respective columns, marching in order, and with perfect ease; the moon being now at the full, and giving in that dry climate a light infinitely brighter and more serene than in ours. Their march was also illuminated by the lofty pillar of fire, which followed the camp as its rereward; and which towering to the very heavens, filled the whole horizon with light, and was reflected far and wide, upon the vast expanse of the waters. The strand on which they trod was hard, firm, and even; yet not rugged, and interspersed with abundance of soft green plants. A large army, with all these circumstances in its favour, might

easily march six leagues in seven or eight hours.\*

I now proceed to the last circumstance of this miraculous passage. Pharaoh, I have before observed, must have encamped behind the mountain of Baal-Zephon, in order to cut off the only chance of escape towards Suez. In this position, especially after evening was closed in, he could not distinctly discern that the sea opened, and that the first troops of the Israelites were already filing off. Secure in the idea that the Hebrews were completely hemmed in, and had no possible chance of escape; Pharaoh (we are told by Josephus)† deferred all thoughts of attacking them till the morrow, and only thought of letting his troops rest from the fatigues of their forced march, that they might be refreshed against the next day's encounter.

Night came on, and we may suppose the Israelites to have made a considerable progress; when at length the motion of such an immense multitude of men, women, children, herds and baggage, redoubling on all sides, was heard by the Egyptians. Pharaoh's first idea must have been, that notwithstanding the undue hour and the utter impossibility of effecting their escape, the Israelites, urged by necessity, had attempted to gain the back of the mountain of Baal-Zephon; a defile through

\* Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.

† See Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 6, and ibid. lib. ii. cap. 4.

\* Pere Sicard.

† Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.

which scarcely twenty men could walk abreast, but which offered the only chance by which any individual of the hosts of Israel could hope to escape to Suez, and tell the tale of his slaughtered brethren. Pharaoh immediately sounds an alarm, rouses his sleeping troops, and resolves to pursue the Israelites wherever they might bend their course. His orders are no sooner issued, than the Egyptians prepare to execute them with all possible dispatch. A very considerable time, however, Josephus informs us, (*Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.*) elapsed before they were ready to set out. And in the very nature of the circumstances, it would appear that it must have been so. Six hundred armed chariots were to be prepared, and fifty thousand horsemen had to go and fetch and get ready their horses, which were piquetted in the plain. For there alone they could have found food; since it would have been utterly impossible to encumber themselves with forage on their forced march. Two hundred thousand infantry, most of them asleep, had also to be roused, dressed, armed, and arranged beneath their standards. All these preparations could not fail to occupy a very considerable portion of time; and Josephus accordingly informs us that it did so.\* However this may be, Pharaoh sat out with this prodigious arma-

ment. He soon perceived that the voices of the multitude before him conducted them, not towards Baal-Zephon, but towards the shore; and imagining that fear had absolutely distracted the hosts of Israel, and led them in the depth of despair, to plunge themselves into inevitable death; they hastened their march in order, by pressing on their rear, to complete their absolute annihilation. At least such is the account of Josephus. Meanwhile Pharaoh rapidly approaches the shore. When the great angel of the covenant, who had hitherto marched in a pillar of fire at the head of the camp of Israel, now suddenly transported it to the rear, and by a new prodigy, the very same pillar which shed a bright light over all the camp of the Israelites, over all the expanse of waters, and over the whole forward horizon; presented a black and menacing column of lurid clouds to the Egyptians; and enveloped in darkness and in dense mists and fog the whole backward horizon towards Pharaoh and his army. Pharaoh, bewildered in a darkness that might be felt, no longer distinguishes the heavens or the earth, and no longer discerns the road he is about to take. He hears indeed the voice of a mingled multitude before him; the bleating of flocks, the lowing of herds, the rumbling of heavy baggage, and the trampling of many feet. He is then assured that his safety cannot be en-

---

\* *Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.*

dangered by following where they lead the way. He therefore urges his troops, and goes straight towards the sound; his cavalry, as Josephus declares,\* taking the lead, the infantry succeeding, and the chariots closing the rear; till without perceiving it, the whole army enter the bed of the sea, and are fully hemmed in between the double wall of suspended waters.†

Many persons have here supposed that a miracle was necessary to prevent the Egyptians from discerning the soft and oozy bed of the ocean: but this is not at all requisite. I have myself examined the bed of the Red Sea on this very spot, with the sole view to the miraculous passage of the children of Israel: and can fully declare, that it is in all respects perfectly similar to the plain of Bede, and only presents a continuation of the same firm even sand: without the least mud or ooze, and thickly interspersed with soft green saline plants. In short, it is in no respect whatever different from the plain in which they had encamped the night before. Hence the Egyptians, enveloped in darkness, and eager in the pursuit, could not precisely distinguish where the plain terminated, and the bed of the sea began. And when at length, the distance must have convinced them that the water was unusually low, they still, Jo-

sephus informs us, concluded themselves in perfect safety, whilst preceded by the hosts of Israel.\* Hence they marched forwards with all diligence, till near the fourth watch; that is, till near three o'clock in the morning; towards which time the rear of the army of the Hebrews was about to gain the opposite shore.†

The God of Israel, who till that time had only declared himself against Pharaoh by the thick darkness which enveloped his army, now at once dissipated that darkness, and unfolded the treasures of his wrath. The miraculous column opens, and shoots forth a blood red and baleful fire. Thunder, whirlwinds, and tempests, burst from its portentous womb; and vivid lightning, in long and reiterated sheets, or in pale and livid flashes, show the terrified hosts of Egypt the full extent of the impending danger. Their horses become unruly, and the terrified infantry in vain seek to escape from the trampling of their fleeing cavalry; whilst the chariots, overthrown and unmanageable, completely hem them in behind. God bears throughout the army of Egypt horror and dismay. Pharaoh in the last consternation, beholds the waters of the ocean suspended like the yawning jaws of huge mountains, ready to close upon him on either side, and to submerge his army both

\* Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.

† Pere Sicard.

\* Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.

† Pere Sicard.



on the left and on the right. He sees no chance of escape but in a precipitate flight. All his hosts, seized with a like panic, flee in dismay, crying aloud, "Flee, flee from Israel! the Lord fights for him and against us!" But it was no longer time: the iniquities of Pharaoh had attained their utmost verge. The hour of mercy was past, and that of judgment was at hand. The last rank of the army of the Hebrews had gained the shore. The Lord commands, and at the words of his voice Moses stretches forth his wonder-working rod; and the mountains of waters descending as a cataract, rush together to unite their closing floods. The roar of mighty waters, the thunders of heaven, the rebellowing of struggling tempests, the piercing shriek of the engulfed army; amidst warring winds and waves, complete the signal and tremendous catastrophe.\* After an interval of dread suspense to the Hebrew army, a deathlike silence succeeds. Day begins to break, and the astonished multitudes of Israel who line the shores, see the first bright beams of the morning sun smile upon a clear expanse of peaceful wave. They could scarcely believe the reality of the astonishing miracle which had just been wrought in their favour, did not the sea, covered with the bodies of their enemies and the wrecks of chariots floating at the mercy of the waves, bear

the spoils of the Egyptian hosts even to their feet on shore. Then, penetrated with the most lively emotions of gratitude and awe, at a deliverance so mighty, so tremendous, and so unheard-of and stupendous; the whole hosts of Israel, with all its mingled multitudes, with one accord, burst into that noble anthem of praise,

"I WILL SING UNTO THE LORD, FOR HE HATH TRIUMPHED GLORIOUSLY!"

MARY ANNE

SCHIMMELPENNINGK.

Bristol, Feb. 9, 1818.

#### ON THE HEBREW ELOHIM.

To the Editors of the *Jewish Expositor*.

Gentlemen,

THE insertion of the following observations in your excellent work will much oblige, your obedient Servant,

EXONIENSIS.

I HAVE always considered the doctrine of the pluri-personality of the Divine Being as a peculiar feature of the Hebrew Scriptures, and have ever entertained the idea expressed in the subsequent words of the Rev. James Kidd,—that "no tortures of criticism, no labours of prejudice, no interpretation of parties, are able to turn aside the full and perfect view, both of the unity of the Divine Essence, and the plurality of persons subsisting in that Essence, represented, signified, and expressed, by these two words, *Jehovah Elohim* (or *Alehim*), the *Lord God*." I was therefore surprised at finding a professed

\* Jos. Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 7.



Trinitarian, like Mr. Bellamy, endeavouring to destroy the obvious force of the term Elohim, or Alehim, by a flat denial of its being of the plural number. Nor was I a little pleased at the observations of Rabbi Crooll in Answer, since much appears to be conceded in what he says,—“It is true, that some of the Jewish doctors will have it, that the word Elohim (or Alehim) is *plural*; others, that it is singular. But, if I were to give my opinion, I would say, that it may be *either singular or plural*. Some of the Rabbins will have it, that *all* the names applied to God are plural, whether they have such a *termination* or not; forasmuch as each of them has a different meaning, unknown to men: and, all that we know about them is indeed nothing, compared with what each contains,—in short, their proper meaning is concealed.” Surely this *concealed meaning* is revealed to us “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;” and when the veil is removed from their hearts, the Jews themselves will perceive it.

But, to return to Mr. Bellamy;—at the end of his History of all Religions, he tells his readers, that Elohim (or Alehim) “is a noun singular, or it could not have been connected with a *verb* singular,” as in the instance of Genesis,—“in the beginning *God created*,” bara Elohim (or Alehim), “the Alehim created.”

This to be sure is rather ora-

cular, as if so self-evident as not to be denied. But could such a reason be admitted, that Alehim must be singular, because it is sometimes associated with a singular verb,—it would be as easy to shew that the term in question must be *plural*, since it has, sometimes, a plural verb connected with it. I might produce many instances of it,—but let a few suffice. In Genesis xx. 13. we read,—“the Alehim, they caused me to wander from my father’s house.” In the thirty-first of Genesis, ver. 53, we read,—“The Alehim of Abraham, and the Alehim of Nahor, the Alehim of their father, they shall judge betwixt us.” And in Genesis xxxv. 7.—“There the Alehim, they appeared unto him.” In these places the true God only is intended, as existing in a plurality of persons; but, from Genesis to Malachi, the Bible is full of examples of the plural signification of the title Alehim, since, in the case of idols, those “strange Alehim,” it is even *translated* plurally, not merely in our English version, but in the Greek of the Septuagint, which may be fairly appealed to, as performed by Jews, and that, near 300 years before the birth of Christ. Nor is Alehim connected with plural verbs only, but with participles, and adjectives, and pronouns in the plural; and this will appear even to the English reader, when he is informed, that the word so frequently translated *Gods* throughout the

Old Testament, is really *Alehim*, and in all respects the same as what, in other instances, is translated God. Of this, the following passage is an illustration, (1 Sam. iv. 7, 8.) "The Philistines said, *God (Alehim)* is come into the camp! Who shall deliver us from these mighty *Gods (Alehim)*?" With respect to its *often* having a singular verb or adjective connected with it, this teaches us, perhaps, that "our Alehim" exist in unity of essence, and are "one Jehovah," and not so many separate gods, like the idolatrous objects of heathen worship. So that it may be fair to say, that *sometimes*, when used in application to the real God, Alehim is connected with verbs, and other parts of speech, of the plural number, in order to put its plurality beyond dispute even when intending the self-existent Jehovah, and thus to establish the doctrine of the Trinity upon an immovable basis; but that, at other times, it is associated with parts of speech in the singular, to remind us of their *unity*, that they are one in nature and essence, although three in person, and thus to distinguish "the true Alehim" from the "strange Alehim" of the nations, who were such only in name, and are therefore said to be "no Alehim." For, with respect to the titles Jehovah and Alehim, the one, though significant of the *Essence*, yet includes the Persons,—and the other, though significant of the

*Persons*, yet includes the *Essence*. And hence, indeed, as the plural Alehim is connected with words that are singular, to maintain the unity of essence in the plurality of persons,—so the singular Jehovah, is connected, at times, with words that are plural, to intimate the plurality of persons in the unity of the undivided essence. Thus, in the eleventh of Genesis, 6, 7.—"Jehovah said, Go to, let *us* go down, and there let *us* confound their language." In Isaiah vi. 1—8, the personage introduced, is called Jehovah and Adonai,—and he says, "Whom shall I send? and who will go *for us*?" Also in Isaiah liv. 5, we read, "Thy Makers (are) thy Husbands, *Jehovah* (is) his name." And in Psalm cxlix. 1, 2. it is written, "Hallelu-jah; sing unto *Jehovah* a new song, his praise in the congregation of saints; let Israel rejoice in his *Makers*." To these, many other passages might be added; and did we pursue Mr. Bellamy's mode of arguing, we should conclude Jehovah to be plural, because connected, at times, with verbs, and other parts of speech, of the plural number. But, I beg to submit, whether it is not a rule of the Hebrew grammar, that a *collective noun singular* may have a plural part of speech in conjunction with it? And if so, since, according to Mr. Bellamy, and to some of the Jewish writers, Jehovah itself intimates a Trinity in the divine nature,—may it not be esteem-

ed a sort of collective noun, and so, although singular, be very correctly associated, as we have seen that it sometimes is, with words that are plural? “The *Je*,” says Mr. B. “means the future, the *Ho* means the present, and the *Vah* the past; which is the divine Trinity.” The Jews of China confessed that by Jehovah they understood the *eternity* of God, and that in it were comprehended the present, the past, and the future, and that it signified the same as,—“He is,—He was,—He is to come;” which treble distinction, to be sure, is well enough suited to designate, not only eternity itself, which unites together, in one immeasurable duration, the yesterday, and the to-day, and the forever,—but that majestic Being also, who, inhabiting eternity, is himself eternal, and subsists, three consistent Alehim in one Jehovah. According to Ambrose Serle, it is observed by the Cabbalistic writers among the Jews, that in Jehovah there are four letters, but only three that differ: *jod* means the Father,—*vau* the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, *vau* being a conjunction copulative,—and *he* the Son; and that he is *doubled*, to denote the two natures in Christ. According to Peter Nigri, a converted Jew, *jod* denoted the essence of Deity, and the other three letters the persons, with a *circle* to intimate the unity. But to leave such uncertain fancies for de-

monstrable truths, — I would submit, secondly, whether, as a collective noun singular may be associated with plurals, a *plural substantive* may not be joined to a *singular adjective*. This seems to be the case with Alehim, which, although joined to plural adjectives, as *Kedoshim*, “the Holy Ones,” and *hayim*, “the Living Ones,” — is at other times connected with singular parts of speech. In this latter case, may it not refer to the unity of essence, in which the Alehim of Israel subsist as Jehovah? Or else, may it not signify *distributively*, as—“the Alehim, each of them is (*kedosh*) holy?” For thus we read of God’s judgments, — “Thy judgments (plural), each (or every one of them) is right (*jeser*, not *jeser-im*).” Psalm cxix. 137. And at the seventy-fifth verse of the same Psalm, it is said, “Thy judgments are righteous,” that is to say, literally, — “Thy judgments, each,” or every one of them, “is righteous;” since it is *zedu*, in the singular, and not *zedu-im*. I would submit, thirdly, whether a plural verb, notwithstanding what Mr. Bellamy may insinuate, may not have a singular nominative case, signifying distributively, and *vice versa*,—that is, may not a *singular verb* also have, at times, a *plural nominative case*? If so, then *Alehim* may be still *plural*, although it sometimes govern a verb singular, as in the instance of “Bara Alehim, the Alehim created;” which may mean,



either that the Alehim, in unity of essence as one Jehovah, created, — or, that the Alehim, *each* of them created, as distinct agents, persons, or modes of subsistence, having a social in-being in the nature of essential Deity. In conclusion, it may be remarked, 1. That the people of Israel are never blamed for worshipping *the Alehim*, provided it is “the Alehim of the Hebrews.”— 2. They are commanded to worship “*their* Alehim” (Alehi-em), and are often reproved for forsaking the true Alehim, and for going after “Alehim *aher-im*,” or *other* Alehim,” and *strange* ones, the false Alehim of idolatrous nations, which are also distinguished as “*new*” ones. But, 3. That Alehim is plural, when applied to God, as well as when applied to false objects of worship, will appear to the English reader from the following examples. In Deuteronomy x. 17. what is rendered the Lord *your God*, is Jehovah *your Alehim*, *Alehi-chem* (plural): and in 1 Sam. vi. 5, the same word, Alehi-chem, is translated “*your Gods*,”—and this, in the Greek of the Septuagint, as well as in our English Bible. In Josh. xxiv. 18. “the Lord, he is our God,” is Jehovah, he is our Alehim, *Alehi-nu* (plural): and, in Isaiah xlii. 17. the word *Alehi-nu* is translated “*our Gods*.” In Leviticus xxvi. 44. we meet with “the Lord *their* God,” Jehovah *their Alehim*, *Alehi-em* (plural): and in Exodus

xxiii. 24. this word Alehi-em is translated “*their Gods*,”— “Thou shalt not bow down to *their* Gods (Alehi-em), — ye shall serve Jehovah *your* Alehim (Alehi-chem.)” In Exodus xx. 1. 2. “the Alehim said, I am Jehovah *thy* Alehim (Alehi-cha): but in Jeremiah ii. 28. this word, Alehi-cha, is translated “*thy Gods*.” In Ezra i. 3. “his God,” is, in the Hebrew, *Alehi-o* (plural): and, in 1 Samuel xvii. 43. it is translated “*his Gods*” (Alehi-o). And, to add no more, in Ruth i. 15. we have “*her Gods*” (Alehi-ha): and, in the next verse, Ruth says to Naomi,—“Thy God (Alehi-cha), shall be my God (Alehi)” —which expressions of Ruth are as much plural as that of Naomi, since *Alehi-cha* is translated “*thy Gods*,” in Jeremiah ii. 28, and *Alehi* is rendered “*my Gods*,” in Genesis xxxi. 30.

From these examples, and they are a brief specimen of the general tenour of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is plain, that the stress should not be laid upon *God* and *Gods*, as in our translation, as if it were *Aleh* and *Aleh-im* in the original,—but it should rest upon the accompanying words, which go to distinguish the Alehim of Israel from the Alehim of the nations; for hence the frequent recurrence of the command to serve Jehovah, *thy*, and *your*, and *our* Alehim, backed by a prohibition from doing service to them that are “*no Alehim*,” and are designated, in contra-

distinction, *their* Alehim, and *other*, or *strange* Alehim, the mimic idols of the superstitious heathen. And thus, the doctrine would be manifest, of a Trinity of persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, as "our Alehim," who are "one Jehovah."

ON THE EVIDENCE WHICH IS AFFORDED IN THE PRESENT DAY, AS AN ANSWER TO THE OBJECTION,—THAT ATTEMPTS TO DO GOOD TO THE JEWS ARE VAIN.

To the Editors of the *Jewish Expositor*.

Gentlemen,

It has often been objected against the London Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, that its labours are in vain, because the prejudices of the Jews in general, are so deeply rooted, that they will not listen to any attempts to turn them from their own way. On this point I cannot agree with the objectors, because I have seen sufficient of human nature, under a nominal profession of Christianity, to be strongly inclined to believe, that the moral certainty of awakening to a spiritual consideration of the things of God, is not very much different in the one case to the other; and I know enough of the dealings of God with the children of men, and of his almighty power and love towards them, to believe, that to do it in the one case, is no more impossible with him, than in the other.

But I think the circumstances of the present day afford abundant refutation of the objec-

tion, by matter of fact; the many instances which are brought to our notice, at home as well as abroad, of Jews being disposed to listen to the things which are stated on the subject of Christianity, — of their increasing attention to their own Scriptures,—and particularly of their willingness to have their children instructed, even by Christian teachers, are proofs that their prejudices are not, in every case, so deeply rooted as have been imagined; or that they are yielding in some measure to the force of truth.

I have been led to these observations from reading the Report of "the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," inserted in the "Missionary Register" for the month of March, in which I find the following passages bearing testimony to the truth of the above remark. The Missionary brethren, writing from Bombay, have stated on the subject of preaching and reading the Scriptures, that at these exercises—"from the time of their commencement, a considerable number of Pagans, and some Jews, have attended," but on the subject of *Schools*, this Report states, "It has before been mentioned, that at the stated meetings for the public reading and exposition of the Scriptures, several Jews have attended; it is gratifying to state here, that in one of the free-schools for Heathen children, there had been, some time, *more than twenty Jewish children*; and

that there should be a school principally for Jewish children, the brethren, more than a year ago, considered as being for several reasons, very desirable. *The Jews themselves*," they then wrote, "*have solicited it.*" They are very poor, and few of their children are at present taught to read and write. In such a school the boys could be taught, without any scruple, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament at least. It would also lead to such an intercourse with the Jews as would be favourable to their instruction in the knowledge of Christ." Under these impressions, they resolved on establishing such a school, as soon as they could obtain a suitable teacher. In the course of the last spring, a Jew of considerable attainments and well acquainted with the language of the country, offered himself for the service. The school was accordingly instituted; it consisted in May, soon after its establishment, of about forty Jewish pupils, who are instructed to read and write both Hebrew and Mahratta. "We think this," say the brethren, "an interesting school, and cannot but hope that it will be a means of doing something towards bringing these ignorant wandering Israelites to the fold of Christ."

As one object of your useful publication is to condense information relative to the progress of light and truth among the Jews, I conceive that extracts of this nature might be

usefully added to the stock of that information, and therefore I should be glad, at all times, to see such appear in your work. It is to be expected that our several institutions engaged in promoting the extension of the kingdom of Christ, will occasionally meet with circumstances of an interesting nature respecting the Jewish people; and though it may be reasonable that they should first appear in their own publications, yet I cannot conceive that the respectable editors will in the least object to furnishing you with those portions which relate to your particular object, or to allowing you to take those extracts from their publications as they appear.

Nor need it be said, that this would be a useless labour, on account of their having appeared before, because your Expositor may pass through a number of channels, different from all the rest; but it may be particularly useful, when it passes into the hands of the sons of Abraham, they should see as much information on the present proceedings of their brethren brought together, as it is possible to collect; its influence on their minds may be expected to be, in some measure, proportionate to its extent.

From the statements which the American missionaries have furnished, as well as from those of many others, and particularly those of our beloved brethren travelling on the Continent; there does appear to be



a most extraordinary movement on the minds of the seed of Jacob in the present day; *which shews, that attempts to do them good are neither vain, or disregarded by them;*—and that this will lead to some grand and important event, in which not only their own nation, but the Christian world in general will also be deeply interested, is not too much to expect, (Isaiah lx.) “The Lord hasten it in *his* time!”

I am, &c.

□

ON

#### THE SACRED NAME JEHOVAH.

WHEN Moses entered upon his divine embassy and he and Aaron went first in unto Pharaoh, the message was, *Thus saith Jehovah the God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a festival to me in the wilderness;* and Pharaoh said, *Who is Jehovah, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go?* *I know not Jehovah, neither will I let Israel go.\** He had never before heard the name of such a God as *Jehovah*, and therefore enquires who he was. They answer, The God of the *Hebrews*; by which answer they describe him only as a *Gentilitical* deity; and we need not wonder that the king, at the first delivery of this message, thought the gods of his own country to be superior, or at least equal, to the God of his slaves.

After the ten severe inflic-

tions upon Egypt, by which this God of the Hebrews proved himself to be superior to the gods of that country, (even by the confession of the magicians themselves) and the affrighted king had dismissed this people and perished in the stubborn pursuit of them afterwards; when God was pleased to propose a public national contract with them in the wilderness, and they had accepted the proposal, the preface to the commandments promulged at Mount Sinai was this, *I am Jehovah thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt.\**

Moses afterwards, in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, tells them, that all those dreadful punishments, with which he there threatens them, should be sent upon them for this very purpose, *That thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name Jehovah thy God.†* Again, in the next chapter, being about to make them renew this contract before his final departure from them, he exhorts them to obedience to it, and tells them, that all those wonders which were done in Egypt by *Jehovah* before their eyes, and all their miraculous support afterwards, during their forty years' abode in the wilderness, were for this end, *That ye might know that I, Jehovah, am your God.‡*

This is all the history of the prophecy of *Noah*, as it opened

\* Exod. v. 1, 2.

\* Exod. xx. 2. † Deut. xxviii. 58.

‡ Deut. xxix. 6.

and displayed itself in the process of time; and all of it shews us, that the separation of this people, and the erecting the theocracy, was in consequence of that prediction, by which it was declared, that *Jehovah* should be the God of Shem. The meaning and design of it indeed began to appear at the call of Abraham, but the full display of it was some hundred years after, at the erection of the theocracy. Thus in the same prophecy the enlargement of Japheth was still longer deferred: for, as Sir Walter Raleigh, in his History of the World, says, the great masters of nations (as far as we can know) were in Abraham's time of the issues of *Ham*; the blessing of God given by Noah to Shem and Japheth, taking less effect until many years were consumed, and until the time arrived, which by the wisdom of God was appointed. For of Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan, came the people and princes which held the great kingdoms of Babylon, Syria, and Egypt, for many descents together.

To this may be added, that the sentence of Ham did never receive its full completion, till the Europeans, the posterity of Japheth, discovered America, and enlarged themselves into it. So astonishing are the ways of God, that the greatest enlargement of Japheth became the greatest and most eminent slavery of Ham.

We have said, that the passages just now quoted from

Moses, are the history of this prophecy, on the part of Shem; that is, that *Jehovah* should be his God. But as this name could not be written in the Greek language, the Septuagint, or Greek translators, rendered it *Ευλογητός Κυριος ὁ Θεός τῆς Σημ*, and always made use of *Κυριος* for *Jehovah*.

Our English translators, who had no such reason, have still followed them in this, and rendered it, *Blessed be the Lord God of Shem*,\* (which is worse than the Greek, as wanting the emphatic *the*) and constantly made use of *Lord* for *Jehovah*. This use may have been one thing that has served to keep the true meaning of this part of the prophecy of Noah at a distance; whereas the retaining the true name *Jehovah* would most certainly have brought this meaning sooner to light. For instance, in the original text, when Moses goes in before Pharaoh, we find *Jehovah* claiming his people; but we find no such in our own translation; where it is only, *Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go*.

I have said that Pharaoh had never heard the name of such a God as *Jehovah* before; and we may now add, that Moses himself had never heard such a name of God till the time of his own legation: when God first gave it to be his name during the course of the wonderful theocracy. His own account of it is as follows:

---

\* Gen. ix. 26.

"Moses said unto God, Behold when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM (or rather I am who am, Ehjeh asher Ehjeh).\* And he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.† And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *Jehovah the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, hath sent me unto you. This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial to generation and generation." That is, this name

*Jehovah* is the name by which I will be perpetually remembered. Again, at the sixth chapter, third verse, he tells him, *I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.*

By all this it appears, that *Jehovah* was to be the name of God, whilst he was pleased to be a Gentilitial God in a moral sense; or in other words, during the course of the *theocracy*. And it is very remarkable that, since the expiration of the *theocracy*, this Gentilitial name of God has ceased amongst the Jews; who by the means of a blind superstition dare never to pronounce it. So that this *memorial* of God has ended with the *theocracy*.

THEOPHILUS.

\* Exod. iii. 13—15. אהיה אשר אהיה

† See John viii. 24.

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE LONDON SOCIETY.

### BAPTISM OF A JEW.\*

A CONVERTED JEW was publicly baptized at the Episcopal Chapel on Sunday morning, April the 12th.

On making application to the minister to be admitted to this ordinance, he stated himself to be in the service of a respectable gentleman just come from abroad, and then stopping in London on his return to Scotland, that having attended divine worship in company with his master, he had,

under the blessing of God, been convinced of the truth of the Gospel, and had come to a fixed resolution of making a public profession of his faith in that name, in which alone he now trusted for the pardon of his sins and the happiness of eternity. After much personal examination, the result of which was highly satisfactory, nothing seemed to be requisite but the testimony of his master, as to the truth of his statements and the sincerity of his motives.



A letter was accordingly written to him, the reply to which is of so pleasing a nature, that we cannot refrain from subjoining it, though from motives of delicacy we omit the name of its respectable author.

Sir,

I RECEIVED your letter this morning respecting my servant Elias Samuel, who surprised me very much the other day, by informing me of his being of the Jewish persuasion. This young man has lived in my service upwards of six months, during which period he has regularly attended divine worship at the English Church in Paris, (Rev. Mr. Forster officiating minister) also at Brussels, and has conducted himself with great propriety and to my entire satisfaction. Soon after he came into my service, on my questioning him a little on religious subjects, I found him very deficient; in consequence I bought him a prayer-book, when he was very soon able to repeat the catechism: at the same time I put a volume of sermons into his hands, which he studied a good deal, and I generally read one or two to him every week. From his earnest manner and desire to improve himself, on a subject so essential to his well-being, the information I received from him of his being a Jew, you may be sure, greatly astonished me. At the same time he stated that fear alone was the reason of his not making this circumstance

known to me at an earlier period, and also that he had for some months come to a fixed and firm resolution of receiving Christian baptism the very earliest opportunity. This resolve I was truly happy to hear, and I desired him to apply to the Secretary of the London Society, where he would receive every information on the subject. The young man's character since he lived with me in my service, has been irreproachable, as far as it was possible for me to know; and although six or seven months is but a short time to form an opinion of it, still, I have very little hesitation in saying, that I believe his motives and desire for Christian baptism are most worthy, and his profession to be truly sincere.

I am, Sir, &c. &c.

*To the Rev. Charles Hawtrey.*

#### CHRISTIAN JEWS.

EXTRACTED FROM THE JOURNAL OF  
A TRAVELLER JUST RETURNED  
FROM HOLLAND.

The following Extract from the Journal of a traveller has been sent us by a friend.

“SOME gentlemen in the passage-boat between Amsterdam and Utrecht happened to meet with several Jews. The weather was then very unfavourable, (as it was just before harvest) and this formed the subject of their conversation. One of the Jews observed, it was a judgment upon the Christians, for their disrespect of the Messiah, the Saviour of the

world. "And what do you care about the Messiah?" said one of the gentlemen, "are not you Jews?"—"Yes," replied the other, "*but we believe as firmly in Christ as most Christians do*—we have been long separated from the Synagogue, and meet by ourselves to read the New Testament,

and pray to Jesus Christ; our members are very numerous in Amsterdam."—"But why," asked the gentleman, "do you not come forward and join the Christians at once?"—"Sir," replied the Jew, "*your practice and profession are so much at variance, that we think we are better by ourselves.*"

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LONDON SOCIETY.

### AUXILIARIES.

Huddersfield Ladies,	per Mrs. Coates .....	14	10	0
Bradford,	per Rev. S. Redhead .....	13	15	0
Bolton Ladies,	per Miss Ainsworth .....	35	0	0
Chester,	per Mr. J. Walker .....	14	7	6
Stroud Ladies,	per Mrs. Offley .....	30	5	6
Camberwell, Peckham, Dulwich, and Clapham Ladies, per Miss Waltham .....		71	1	3
Leeds Ladies,	per Mrs. Joshua Dixon .....	42	15	6
Melton Mowbray Ladies,	per Miss H. Shepherd .....	35	17	0
Kendal,	per Mr. E. Tatham .....	80	15	9
Calcutta Ladies' Association,	per Rev. T. Thomason .....	100	0	0
Cambridge Ladies,	per Mrs. Dornford .....	4	4	0

### PENNY SOCIETIES.

Chester Ladies, per Mrs. Thackeray . . .	<i>for Female Department</i>	25	12	6
Birmingham,	per Miss Bull . . . . .	4	0	6
Helstone Ladies,	per Miss Trevenen . . . . .	17	10	4
Chesterton,	per Miss H. Stephen . . . . .	8	0	0
Rumsey,	per Rev. James Crabb . . . . .	6	3	6
Camden Town,	per Miss Crisp, <i>Half Yearly Collection</i>	1	6	0
Tamworth,	per Rev. F. Blicke . . . . .	5	19	6

### HEBREW TESTAMENT.

Bradford Ladies, per Rev. S. Redhead .....	0	5	0
Mrs. Rogers, Penrose, per Miss E. F. Trevenen .....	1	0	0
Anonymous, per ditto .....	2	2	0
Rev. John Parry, Clocaenog, Ruthin, North Wales .....	1	0	0
Leeds Ladies, per Mrs. Dixon .....	25	17	6
Biggar Association for aiding in the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge by Missions, Schools, and Tracts, per Oliphant, Waugh, and Co. Edinburgh .....	5	0	0
A Lady, per Dr. Davidson, by Oliphant and Co. ....	2	0	0
Kendal Auxiliary, per Mr. E. Tatham .....	5	15	6
Mrs. R. Allen, Howey House, Old Down, per Bristol Auxiliary	1	0	0
Miss Maria Allen, ditto, per ditto .....	1	0	0
H. Noyes, Esq. Thurston, per Rev. James Crabb .....	1	0	0

HEBREW TESTAMENT—*continued.*

Hon. Eleanor Digby, per Messrs. Hoare .....	1	0	0
Rev. Mr. Preston, per Mrs. Dornford, Cambridge.....	1	1	0
I. J. D. by Mr. H. C. Christian, "A Loan repaid".....	1	0	0
Miss Foe, per Miss Saverland, Falmouth.....	5	0	0
Mrs. R. W. Foe, per ditto .....	1	0	0
Mrs. Saverland, per ditto.....	1	0	0
Thomas Hartley, Esq. ditto .....	1	0	0
Captain Kempe, ditto .....	1	0	0

## FUND FOR BUILDING SCHOOLS.

March 9. Collection at St. Saviour's, by Rev. William Marsh...	13	2	8
21. J. Watson, Esq. Patriot-square .....	2	2	0
23. Miss Haygarth.....	1	1	0
27. Boxes in the Episcopal Jews' Chapel.....	5	15	0
April 15. Miss Lye, Bath .....	4	14	9
Colchester Auxiliary Society, by C. Boutflower, Esq. ..	11	10	6
Rev. R. Hitchins, Falmouth, by Miss Trevenen .....	2	2	0
J. Hocker, Esq. ditto, ditto .....	1	1	0
Hans Town Ladies' Penny Society, by Mrs. Longley,			
[Ninth Quarter	3	7	3
Ditto, ditto, Tenth do...	8	19	10
16. Collected at St. Swithin's, London Stone, after a Sermon by the Rev. Basil Woodd .....	10	8	9
17. Episcopal Chapel Ladies' Penny Society....	30	13	2
Mrs. Jenuings .....	2	2	0
Miss Drack .....	0	10	0
Mrs. Hawtreys .....	1	0	0
	34	5	2
Profit of the Rev. C. S. Hawtreys Sermon on the Death of the Princess Charlotte of Wales....	14	18	6
Miss Davis, for work done by her and sold .....	4	4	6
Mrs. F. Hale, Cannon Street, collected by her .....	1	8	2

## DONATIONS, &amp;c.

Rev. William Napper, collected in the Parish of Old Ross, Wexford, Ireland .....	2	6	10
Mr. Baillie, Drylaw, per Oliphant, Waugh, and Co. Edinburgh.	2	2	0
A Lady, per Mr. Plenderleath, by ditto .....	0	10	6
Ditto, per Rev. Dr. Davidson, by ditto .....	3	0	0
Ditto, per H. Glass, by ditto .....	3	3	0
Mr. Watson's Children, by ditto .....	0	10	6
Henry Walker, Esq. Blyth, near Bawtry, Notts.....	10	0	0
Mrs. Hooper, Reading, collected by her .....	2	0	0
Mr. R. Heath and Friends, at Warrington, Lancashire.....	6	0	0
Mrs. Thompson, Kirby Hall, York.. ..	3	1	0
Hon. Eleanor Digby, per Messrs. Hoare.....	10	0	0
Miss Agnes. Carnegie, per ditto .....	5	0	0
Mr. J. Smith, jun. per ditto .....	0	14	0

## CONGREGATIONAL COLLECTION.

Cambridge, Trinity Church, (Rev. C. Simeon) after a Sermon by Rev. L. Richmond.....	74	3	2
Deduct Expenses .....	3	5	0
	70	18	2





**For use in Library only** ..

For use in Library only



I-7 v.3  
Jewish Expositor and Friend of Israel

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00314.8089